

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
AUGUST 1, 2006**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on August 1, 2006 at 6:16 p.m. by Chairman Thompson in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Merz, Smith, Worthington, Chrm. Thompson

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Kosla

STAFF PRESENT: Will Wong, Community Development Director;
Reg Murray, Senior Planner; Steve Geiger,
Associate Planner; Sue Fraizer, Administrative
Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the June 20, 2006 meeting were approved as submitted.

ITEM III: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. **Use Permit Amendment and Tree Permit Amendment – 4205 Eagles Nest (Canyon Rim Estates) – File #UP Amend 02-9(A); TP Amend 03-1(A).** The applicant requests approval of amendments to the Use Permit and Tree Permit originally approved for the Canyon Rim Estates Subdivision. The request is for subdivision entrance improvements, including a monument sign, decorative structure for mail boxes, landscaping, and walls.

Director Wong gave the staff report. This request is for approval of an amendment to an existing Use Permit for the

Canyon Rim subdivision and an amendment to the existing Tree Permit at the Canyon Rim subdivision, a 22 lot single-family subdivision at the end of Eagles Nest. Staff felt that the proposed subdivision improvements at the entrance to the subdivision were substantial enough to require an amendment to the use permit and an amendment to the tree permit. Proposed is a monument sign at the entrance, decorative paving, and a mailbox turnout with landscaping and decorative retaining walls. Staff feels this is a compliment to the entrance of the subdivision and is recommending approval.

Comm. Merz asked if the subdivision map and the use permit are still valid, since this was previously approved for two years, or until 2005.

Director Wong replied that the map was already recorded and is still valid.

The public hearing was opened.

The architect, Mike Murphy stated that he is representing the applicant. He passed a photo showing the location. There will be a retaining wall and a series of terraces. He feels this will be a classy entry to the subdivision.

Comm. Worthington commented about the landscaping plan. She asked about the color of the stamped concrete.

Mr. Murphy replied that a decision has not been made, but they may use cobblestone, rock or brick. He asked if brick were used if that would be acceptable.

Director Wong responded that the use of brick would be fine, but if neither cobblestone or brick were proposed, the applicant would have to come back to the Commission.

Ms. Lola Altus of 1788 Arroyo Drive expressed her desire that the tree height be monitored so that her view is not compromised.

There was discussion about the types of trees that could be used that would not restrict Ms. Altus' view.

Mr. Murphy stated that the developer has informed him that as a good neighbor he will restrict the height of the trees so the Altus' view is not blocked.

Comm. Smith asked if a restriction should be placed on the project for the type of trees that can be used.

Director Wong replied that it would be a difficult thing to enforce.

Comm. Worthington suggested that the applicant choose trees with small to medium mature tree height.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Merz **MOVED** to:

Adopt Resolution 06-12 for the amendments to the approved Use Permit and Tree Permit for the Canyon Rim Estates subdivision (Files UP AMEND 02-9(A) And TP AMEND 03-1(A) as presented.

Comm. Worthington **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Merz, Smith, Worthington, Chrm. Thompson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Kosla

The motion was approved.

ITEM V: COMMISSION BUSINESS

- A. Consideration of Pavement Management Systems and recommendation for a Construction Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee.

Planner Murray stated that this item is on the Agenda at the request of the Planning Commission through previous interest. There are two items of discussion. One is the pavement management systems and the other is whether a construction traffic impact mitigation fee should be implemented.

Planner Murray asked the Director of Public Works to discuss the City's current practices regarding the pavement management system.

Jack Warren, Director of Public Works explained that the pavement management system is an inventory of the City's existing streets and a rating of their current condition. This is a useful tool in determining how to spend the City's resources. The rating is zero to 100, with 100 being a new street. The pavement gradually deteriorates until a certain point, then declines rapidly. If the road is repaired just prior to this rapid decline, it is more cost effective.

Comm. Worthington asked what rating number is the point of no return.

Director Warren stated that it is somewhere between 60 and 70. The road still looks good at this point, but if we wait for a couple more years, it is too late to repair the road.

Comm. Smith stated that he believes there should be some way to preserve the streets through mitigation fees.

Director Warren said that the pavement management system is a guide to show the best way to invest maintenance resources. The construction traffic impact fee is a totally separate issue.

Comm. Worthington asked how often a full inventory is done.

Director Warren said that they do one inventory, then as maintenance is performed the inventory is updated.

Comm. Worthington asked if the Streetsaver software program could be used.

Director Warren replied that Streetsaver is not currently used, and although it is a good program, to transfer all of the data would be labor intensive.

City Councilman, Bob Snyder, 100 Green Ave. stated that the City Council asked the previous Public Works Director to prepare a report, which was done. At that time the City Council increased the budget to over 1 million dollars to be sure to cycle through the maintenance over a 20 year period.

Director Warren spoke about a mitigation fee related to construction traffic. The law does not allow the City to assess a fee for maintenance of the roads. A fee could be assessed for something over and above maintenance. If the damage to the road could be tracked back to who caused the damage, then

that party would be required to pay the fee to repair that damage. The problem is that when there is a mixture of construction traffic and regular everyday traffic, one cannot be singled out from the other. A study would need to be done to determine that there is no doubt about the connection between the developer's activities and the impact to our system. This would not be easy or inexpensive.

Comm. Smith expressed his concern about the impact to the roads by heavy trucks versus cars and he feels a fee could be built in to repair any wear and tear caused by the trucks.

Director Warren replied that the only way to do that would be to determine a fair way to calculate a formula for what the fee should be. He stated that to his knowledge, no other City or County has implemented such a fee.

There was discussion about the possibility of a need for such a fee, and the current trip-end fee.

Director Warren suggested that Public Works staff survey other areas to see what they have done and bring back the results to the Commission.

Bob Snyder, 100 Green Avenue spoke about the trip-end fee. This fee is a calculation of how many people in that subdivision leave their home, go somewhere, and return home. He stated that currently taxes are collected for road repair. The truck companies would argue that they pay their fair share now.

Comm. Smith stated that he feels the developer should pay the additional fee.

Mr. Snyder said that first the damage would have to be identified, then a calculation of how many trips were made and who caused the damage. In his opinion, the fee could not be universal, it would vary. He feels that Staff is already too busy to do this survey.

There was discussion about the survey and who should do the survey.

It was determined that Staff would survey some cities to see if they are charging such a fee, and what they base it on.

- B. Hwy 49 Corridor Management Plan – recommendation to hire a consultant to develop a Hwy 49 Corridor Management Plan.

This item was postponed due to a technical difficulty with the equipment needed for the presentation.

ITEM VI: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A. Auburn Bluffs Subdivision appeal will be heard by the City Council either September 11, 2006 or September 25, 2006. Director Wong will inform the Commission when he knows the exact date.
- B. At this time there are no items to be presented on August 15, 2006. If a meeting is necessary, the Commission will be informed.
- C. None.

ITEM VII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

None.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

If there is a Planning Commission meeting on August 15, 2006, the Hwy 49 Corridor Management Plan will be discussed.

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

